

The University of Chicago

A COMPARATIVE STUDY
OF THE
THEODOTIIONIC AND SEPTUAGINT
TRANSLATIONS OF DANIEL

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AND EARLY
CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

By
ALLEN PAUL WIKGREN

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1932

The University of Chicago

A COMPARATIVE STUDY
OF THE
THEODOTIIONIC AND SEPTUAGINT
TRANSLATIONS OF DANIEL

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AND EARLY
CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

By
ALLEN PAUL WIKGREN

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1932



INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of the present investigation to contribute to the study of the characteristics of translation Greek which is part of a research project in the Septuagint recently initiated by the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature of The University of Chicago. More specifically, the endeavor has been made upon the basis of a comparative study of the Septuagint and Theodotionic translations of Daniel 1:2 - 2:4 and 8 to isolate some of the translation phenomena definitely characteristic of these renderings, to indicate statistically the departures of the texts from the Hebrew and their differences inter se, and to test by a few examples the applicability of the findings as criteria for the estimation of the quality of other Greek, in particular that of the Gospels for which Semitic originals have been postulated.

The book of Daniel presents notable opportunities for such an investigation because of the two complete, independent, and differently executed Greek translations extant, and because approximately half of the Massoretic text is in Aramaic. The latter fact is of special value in developing criteria for appraising the quality of the Greek of the New Testament documents, and the relatively literal Theodotion and paraphrastic Septuagint exhibit together a wide range of translation phenomena. This study is confined primarily to the Hebrew of the sections already indicated,¹ but a number of particular phenomena have been examined throughout the book, and those for which the Gospels have been interrogated are of a Semitic rather than solely Hebraic character.

¹Professor J. M. Rife has already contributed an investigation of the translations of the Hebrew of 1:1-16 and the Aramaic of 2:4-22 together with a more extensive study of the article, idioms of dating, and especially word order. See "Some Translation Phenomena in the Greek Versions of Daniel" (Ph. D. Dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1931).

The investigation was begun by a thorough comparison of the translations with the Hebrew and with each other. In 1:1-2:4 all variants were first entered upon cards, the instances when both translations agreed in literally reproducing the original text being so few that almost the entire text was thus represented. Upon the cards were noted the Greek and Hebrew, a literal English translation of each, variant readings of other MSS, versions, etc., as provided in the texts of H. B. Swete¹ and Holmes and Parsons² for the Greek and R. Kittel³ for the Hebrew, and a brief description and attempted explanation of the variants. These were then classified and the divergences of chapter 8 entered directly under the resulting categories, textual variants only being noted if significant. Some characteristic literalisms were investigated throughout Daniel and also sought for in the Gospels and in eight volumes of Greek papyri of the Ptolemaic period.⁴ Finally the data of each category were statistically summarized and evaluated. Variants due to a different Hebrew text or to mistranslations were noted but excluded in the evaluation of the comparative literalness of the two Greek versions.

¹The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint, vol. III⁴ (Cambridge, University Press, 1925).

²Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus, vol. III (Oxford, University Press, 1798).

³Biblia Hebraica, Pars II² (Stuttgart, Privileg. Wurt. Bibelanstalt, 1925).

⁴Ulrich Wilcken, Urkunden Der Ptolemaerzeit, Parts I-III (Berlin und Leipzig, Verlag von Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1922-27). B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, The Hibeh Papyri, Part I (Oxford, University Press, 1906); The Amherst Papyri, Part II (Oxford, University Press, 1901). F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell, Greek Papyri in the British Museum, Part I (London, Wm. Clowes & Sons, 1893); Parts II and III (Oxford, University Press, 1898 and 1907).

PART I

METHODS OF TRANSLATION

To provide for an appreciation of the differences in method exemplified by the Greek translations a number of passages are given below together with the Hebrew original. Some 45 such passages were particularly noted in which the LXX paraphrased or otherwise freely translated the Hebrew and Θ rendered it with a high degree of literalness. The opposite situation was noted only 5 times (in 2:3,4; 8:3,13,19), one of which in 8:3 is highly to be suspected.¹ These do not include instances of vocabulary in which Θ is occasionally less exact than the LXX.² Such a preview should render the subsequent particularized statements and statistics more intelligible and meaningful, for the latter cannot, as these examples do, exhibit the syntactical and grammatical relationships involved in departures from the Hebrew. Some of the more interesting and instructive examples follow.

	LXX	Θ	MT
1:1	Ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἰωα- κείμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἔτους τρίτου	Ἐν ἔτει τρίτῳ τῆς βασιλείας Ἰωακείμ βασιλέως Ἰούδα	בשנת שלוש לסלכות יהויקים סלך יהודה
1:4	νεανίσκους ἁμώ- μους καὶ εὐειδεῖς καὶ ἰσχύοντάς ὥστε εἶναι	νεανίσκους οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς μῶμος καὶ καλοὺς τῇ ὄψει καὶ οἷς ἔστιν ἰσχύς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστάναι	ילדים אשר אין בהם כל סאום ומובי סראה ואשר כח בהם לעמד

¹There is weighty textual support in each translation for the directly opposite reading. The usual symbols, LXX for the Septuagint, Θ for Theodotion, and MT for Massoretic Text will be used henceforth.

²See pp. 6f.

	LXX	Θ	MT
1:8	καὶ ἐνεθυμήθη Δανιῆλ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ	καὶ ἔθετο Δανιῆλ ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ	וַיִּשַׁב דָּנִיֵּאל עַל לִבּוֹ
1:17	καὶ τοῖς νεανίσκοις ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος	καὶ τὰ παιδάρια ταῦτα; οἱ τέσσαρες αὐτοί, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς	וַהֲלִידִים הָאֵלֶּה אַרְבַּע נָתַן לָהֶם הָאֱלֹהִים
2:1	συνέβη εἰς ὁράματα καὶ ἐνύπνια ἐμ- πεσεῖν τὸν βασιλέα	ἡνυπνιάσθη Ναβου- χοδονοσοῦρ ἐνύπνιον	וַהֲלִידִים הָאֵלֶּה אַרְבַּע נָתַן לָהֶם הָאֱלֹהִים
8:3	ἀναβλέψας εἶδον κριδὸν ἕνα μέγαν ἑστῶτα	καὶ ἤρα τοῦς ὀφθαλ- μοῦς μου καὶ ἶδον, καὶ ἰδοῦ κριδὸς εἷς ἑστηκῶς	וַאֲשֶׁר עֵינַי וַאֲרָא וְהִנֵּה אֵיל אֶחָד עֹמֵד
8:4	ὧς ἤθελε	κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ	כַּרְצוֹ
8:27	καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐπραγ- ματευόμεν πάλιν βασιλικά	καὶ ἀνέστην καὶ ἐποιοῦν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ βασιλέως	וַאֲשֶׁר עֵינַי וַאֲרָא וְהִנֵּה אֵיל אֶחָד עֹמֵד

The extreme freedom which often characterizes the LXX translation sometimes makes it difficult to say when a particular rendering is or is not really a mistranslation. In compiling a list of these, however, the translators were given the benefit of any doubt. Yet some 26 indubitable errors were noted (LXX-15, Θ-11, coincide-5), most of which were due to misunderstanding the meaning of the Hebrew. So, e.g., in 1:5 τραπέζης (Θ), 1:10 τραχήλῳ (LXX), 1:15 ἰσχυροί (Θ), and 8:4 μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα and ὁπ(σω)(LXX) the original text is mistranslated.¹ The force of the Hebrew construction is missed by Θ in 1:12 (καὶ παγόμεθα -- πιδόμεθα) and 8:6 (ἑστῶς), by the LXX in 8:10, and by both in 8:4 where Θ reads a future and the LXX an acrist for the Hebrew potential imperfect יִרְוּ כָל. Five other renderings, 3 by Θ and 2 by the LXX, were very inadequate though not enough so to be called mistranslations.²

¹Others occur in 2:1; 8:2, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26. Two or three of these may be due to corrupt or difficult text.

²E.g. in 8:10 and 18.

It is evident that when such partial departures as occur in paraphrasing are disregarded the mistranslations are relatively few in number and unimportant. Again, while Θ is ostensibly engaged in obviating differences from the Hebrew sense, he has as many as the LXX in these sections.

In connection with inadequate translation we should mention transliteration, a favorite device of Θ even at times when there could have been no doubt about the meaning of the Hebrew.¹ Five instances, one shared with the LXX in 8:13, occur in these chapters as follows: 1:3 φορθομεῖν, 1:11,16 Ἀμελσάδ, 8:2 τῇ βάρει,² 8:2,3,6 Οὐβάλ, and 8:13 φελμουει (LXX φελμουνι). They seem to be all due to ignorance of the Hebrew meaning.³ Other instances occur in 11:38 (μωζεῖν), 11:41,45 (σαβαεῖν), and 12:6f. (βαδδεῖν), all of them by Θ .

About two dozen phrases or expressions were recorded, also, in which both translations deserted the Hebrew for idiomatic renderings, almost half of which were identical. A typical assortment of these is given below together with the original text.⁴

LXX	Θ	MT
1:10 τὸν ἐκτάξαντα	Same	אשר סנה
ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ	μή ποτε ἴδῃ	אשר לסה יראה
συντρεφομένους ὕμῃν	τὰ συνήλικα ὕμῶν	אשר כנילכם
2:1 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ	Same	עליו
8:6 τὸν τὰ κέρατα	τοῦ τὰ κέρατα	בעל הקרניים
ἔχοντα	ἔχοντας	
8:7 ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν	Same	ארצה ⁶
8:23 πληρουμένων	Same	כהתם

¹According to J. Reider in Prolegomena To A Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index To Aquila (Philadelphia, 1916) Theodotion transliterates more than Aquila.

²The LXX mistranslates this word.

³For discussions of these see R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1929).

⁴See also 1:5, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18, 20; 8:7, 10, 11, 16, 20, 21.

⁵Aquila translates literally ἐκ' αὐτόν.

⁶So in 8:10, but in 8:12 both translate χαμαί.

It will be noticed that these do not represent such radical and significant departures from the original as did the paraphrastic renderings of the LXX. Theodotion's extravagances amount usually to no more than the harmless alteration of a word or two. One favorite expedient seems to be the use of the article as a relative to translate אֲשֶׁר, hardly to be described as free translation.

The favorite literalistic device of representation, or of unvarying translation of a Hebrew word or phrase by the same Greek, though frequent in Θ , is far from being universally applied. His tendency in this direction is indicated, however, in many places. The verb נָבַר, e.g., occurs 5 times in the eighth chapter¹ and is invariably translated by μεγαλύνω, but in the LXX it is thrice rendered by ὑψώ and twice by κατασχέω. Θ and the LXX each use ἀνθρῶπος 24 times in Daniel. Θ so translates אָנוּשׁ (or אִנּוּשׁ) 21 times, but the LXX usage is distributed over נָבַר (7), אָנוּשׁ (7), אָדָם (4), אִישׁ (4), חַי (1), and בֶּן אָנוּשׁ (1). Θ translates 15 occurrences of נָבַר by ἀνέψ whereas the LXX renders 14 occurrences 7 times by ἀνέψ and 7 by ἀνθρῶπος. Yet neither translator availed himself of the ideal opportunity for representation as well as more accurate translation afforded in 8:16 by the occurrence of both נָבַר and אָדָם, for Θ renders each by ἀνέψ and the LXX each by ἀνθρῶπος. Likewise in 8:26 two entirely different words for "vision", כִּרְאָה and חֲזוֹן, are translated by the same word, τὸ ὄραμα in the LXX and ἡ ὄρασις in Θ . Examples of this kind could be multiplied. The great deal of variation that exists in the translation of the various parts of speech will be presented later.²

In general the vocabulary of the LXX is richer and more varied than that of Θ , and exhibits more idiomatic usages. Θ in attempting to render a Hebrew word by the exactly corresponding Greek root is sometimes less accurate than the LXX in reproducing the actual Hebrew meaning. It seems, too, from the limited observation afforded by the sections studied that the LXX translator had a slightly better knowledge of Hebrew than Θ . Some examples

¹8:4, 8, 9, 11, 25.

²E.g., the idiomatic יָעַל, translated in a half-dozen different ways by Θ , although ἐνέπιον predominates. See pp. 9f.

of differences in vocabulary follow.

	LXX	Θ	MT
1:4	διάλεκτον	γλῶσσαν	לשון
1:9	τιμὴν χάριν	ἔλεον οἰκτειροῦν	חסד רחם
1:12, 16	τῶν ὁσπρίων	τῶν σπερμάτων	זרעיהם
1:18, 22	ἐπέταξεν	εἶπεν	צוה
8:4	πρὸς δυσμὰς	κατὰ θάλασσαν	סוף
8:6	ἐν θυμῷ	ἐν ὀρμῇ	בפניו
8:9	ἀνεφύη	ἐξῆλθεν	יצא
8:17	ἐθορυβήθη	ἐθαμβήθη	נבהת
8:18	ἡγείρε με	καὶ ἔστησέν με	ויערני

In all but the eighth of these Θ is translating by the root meaning of the Hebrew. The LXX does so in none of these instances, but seeks rather to employ more idiomatic terminology or to find a meaning more suitable to the context. Yet only one of the usages of the LXX, that of 1:9, is inaccurate, whereas at least the third and the last three are more accurate than the renderings of Θ.

PART II

SOME CHARACTERISTIC TRANSLATION PHENOMENA

One of the most noticeable features of the translations, especially that of Θ, is the extreme frequency of καί and of paratactic construction. A worthy example is presented by Θ in 8:27 which reads καὶ ἐγὼ Δανιὴλ ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ἐμαλακίσθην· καὶ ἀνέστην καὶ ἐπαίουν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ ἐθαύμαζον τὴν ὄρασιν, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ συνίων. Other such instances are to be found in both at 1:19; 2:1; 8:4,7,12,16, and 24, and in Θ at 1:12; 2:2; 8:2f., 17f., etc. The LXX, as exemplified in the paraphrases previously cited, adopts a hypotactic rendering a few times, especially by altering a finite verbal form to a participle. So, e.g., in 2:2 it reads καὶ παραγενόμενοι ἔστησαν for Theodotion's καὶ ἦλθαν καὶ ἔστησαν. Other instances may be seen in 1:1; 8:2,3,18, and 27. It also employs a genitive absolute 5 times (in 8:1,2,18,23), that of 8:23 being shared by Θ. The scarcity of this common Greek usage, of the familiar μέν - δέ construction, and of adversative particles are characteristics which contribute to the parataxis and profusion of καί in both translations. The idiomatic μέν - δέ occurs throughout the entire book of Daniel only 8 times in the LXX¹ and twice in Θ² in the translated portions. Simple δέ is frequent in the LXX but occurs only 7 times in Θ,³ each time in the Aramaic chapters. Ἀλλά and γάρ are conspicuous by their absence. It is of interest to note that in the much less extensive Greek additions of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon δέ is found 20 and 14 times respectively.

It is true that some at least of these phenomena are met

¹1:7; 2:24,33,41,42; 3:15,23; 12:2.

²2:41,42.

³2:6,15,24,30; 3:15; 4:15; 5:17.

with in the Κοινή Greek but hardly in such proportions. Perhaps the number would be increased if more non-literary papyri of narrative content existed. Expressions like καὶ ἔδν τολμήσωσι καὶ καταβῶσι¹ occur and καὶ is frequent, but consistent parataxis is absent. Genitive absolutes, for example, are overwhelmingly frequent in the papyri. In a writer like Arrian καὶ is about half as frequent as in Daniel, and in Josephus the occurrences are even fewer. In a passage of 212 words taken at random from the latter only 5 were used, whereas there were 30 in the first 215 words of the eighth chapter of Daniel by Θ, 28 by the LXX.² Josephus' average, however, seems to be about twice that of the section indicated. It is apparent that parataxis with its profusion of the coordinate conjunction and lack of subordinating idioms and adverbative particles is an outstanding characteristic of translation Greek. It is, in fact, a feature of the LXX in general and is directly proportionate in amount to the literalness of translation.

There is also a noticeable frequency in places, e.g. here in chapter 8, of the personal pronoun, particularly in the genitive to denote possession. Profusion of personal pronouns in the oblique cases is, however, a characteristic of the non-literary Κοινή in general³ and is therefore inconclusive alone as evidence of translation. Such evidence must be limited to a pleonastic and often unidiomatic ἐγὼ for ἡ or ἡν as in 8:1 by Θ, ἔφθην πρὸς μέ, ἐγὼ Δαυὶδ, κ.τ.λ. Other instances of this occur in 1:10; 8:5, 15, 27; 9:2, etc.

In addition to these more general phenomena a number of specific literalisms were noted which, although in most instances possible or perfectly legitimate Greek, were because of the original Hebrew overly frequent or used in lieu of more idiomatic expressions. Θ is fond of ἐνώπιον as a translation of ἔμπρ and

¹U P Z 64, l. 10.

²In lists Θ and the LXX generally conform to Greek idiom by adding conjunctions before all items or by omitting that before the last which Hebrew idiom retains. So in 1:6f., 11, 19, etc.

³E.g. in U P Z 79, ll. 15-17, Οἶστο ἄνθρωπον λέγειν μοι· ἔφερε τὸ δέρμα τοῦ ποδὸς σου καὶ ἐγὼ δώσω σοι τὸ δέρμα τοῦ ποδὸς μου. Ἐγὼ seems to be used here for emphasis.

related usages of $\epsilon\iota\epsilon$, using it 33 times as compared to 4 by the LXX in the translated portions. The LXX seems to prefer $\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ but also uses a dozen other locutions. A literal translator would be prone to overuse $\epsilon\nu\omega\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ because of its correspondence to the Hebrew.¹

A similar situation exists in the use of $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ and less frequently $\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ with the accusative in expressions of comparison to translate the idiomatic Semitic usage with כ and ל . The Greek is of course perfectly permissible. Liddell and Scott cite usages from Herodotus and Thucydides; Moulton and Milligan and others give examples from the papyri. But the frequency of the construction in Daniel coupled with the almost total absence of the common Greek genitive of comparison marks it here as a literalism. Of 6 כ constructions (1:10,15; 2:30; 8:3; 11:2,13) Θ translates 4, the LXX 3, by $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ and the accusative, Θ 2 and the LXX 1 by $\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ and the accusative, and the LXX 1 by the genitive of comparison. Two occurrences of the parallel ל usage (1:20; 3:19) are rendered once each way by the LXX and once by the $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ construction in Θ . Θ has a different text in 3:19. The following examples amply illustrate the various usages in both the Greek and Hebrew.

	LXX	Θ	MT
1:15	$\eta \xi\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\omega\nu \tau\omega\nu \delta\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ $\nu\epsilon\alpha\nu\iota\sigma\chi\omega\nu$	$\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\omicron\iota \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho \tau\grave{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\alpha$	טוב ובריאי בשן מן כל הילדים
1:20	$\sigma\omicron\phi\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\text{--}$ $\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\iota\omega\varsigma \upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$	$\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\pi\lambda\alpha\sigma\iota\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$	עשר ידות על כל החרשים
11:13	$\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta\nu \mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\omicron\nu\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha} \tau\eta\nu \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\nu$	$\delta\chi\lambda\omicron\nu \mu\omicron\lambda\acute{\omicron}\nu \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\tau\omicron\nu \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$	הסון רב מן הראשון

It is interesting to note that the LXX uses the $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ construction twice (1:13,20) where there is no expression of comparison in the Hebrew. In the Greek additions, too, it is found twice in the LXX and once in Θ .

¹But cf. Aquila's even more literal $\pi\rho\delta \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\nu$.

Chapters 8 and following contain a noticeable use of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive corresponding to the Hebrew construction with כּ or, less frequently, ו and the infinitive. It occurs here 10 times in θ¹ and 8 in the LXX,² all but the 3 in 8:8, 19 and 10:9 representing the כּ usage. Of the 3 instances where θ does not read with the LXX 2 are apparently due to text³ and 9:27 is an addition. In the remaining 4 differences 10:9 and 12:7 are textual and 8:8 is rendered by a ὅτε clause and 8:18 by a genitive absolute in the LXX. The translators clearly found it difficult to avoid the infinitive usage when confronted by it in the Hebrew. On the other hand, with the exception of the LXX in 9:27, they never use it elsewhere in the Hebrew chapters although it is acceptable Greek.⁴ The literalism of the occurrences in Daniel extends also in every instance but one to the expression of a personal pronoun as the subject of the infinitive, corresponding to the pronominal affix of the Hebrew.

Ἰδοὺ occurs with fair frequency in Daniel and is used in the Hebrew sections with one exception as a translation of הוּנָה. θ and the LXX coincide on 10 uses⁵ and the former has one, the latter two others. In 8:3 the LXX omits and in 10:8 it adds the expression. In 9:4 it is translating אָנֹכִי, omitted by θ. There are as many more occurrences in the Aramaic, employed to translate אָנֹכִי or אֲנִי. The literalism of the expression⁶ should be extended to include the καὶ which is generally prefixed to it and the parenthetic form which it assumes. Without καὶ it occurs only 8 times out of the total of 41 in both translations, and of these at least 5 are without the conjunction in the original. Yet 4 of the 6 occurrences in Bel and the Dragon and Susanna omit the καὶ.

Ἐπεὶ is also unduly frequent, occurring 21 times in θ⁷

¹8:8, 15, 17, 18; 10:9, 11, 15, 19; 11:34; 12:7.

²8:15, 17; 9:27; 10:11, 15, 19; 11:2, 4.

³כּ for כּ in 11:2 and 4.

⁴See J. H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, I³ (Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1908), 14, 215, 249.

⁵In 8:5, 15, 19; 9:21; 10:5, 10, 13, 16; 11:2; 12:5.

⁶See Moulton, op. cit., p. 11 for its Greek character.

⁷1:21; 8:6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14; 9:25, 26, 27; 10:3; 11:10, 24, 35, 45; 12:1, 4 (twice), 6, 9.

and 13 in the LXX¹ in the Hebrew chapters, all but one² being translations of *καί*, whose conjunctive, adverbial, and prepositional functions this particular Greek word was fitted to fulfil. The fact that over half the occurrences are prepositional, however, makes the overusage especially un-Greek, and the LXX translator has evidently exerted himself to avoid it. The various usages and translations are illustrated by the following examples.

	LXX	Θ	MT
8:6	καὶ ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν κρίδν	καὶ ἦλθεν ἕως τοῦ κρίου	וַיָּבֹא עַד הַאֵי
8:8	σφόδρα	ἕως σφόδρα	עַד מְאֹד
8:13	ἕως τίνος	ἕως πότε	עַד מָה
11:35	ἕως καιροῦ συν- τελείας	ἕως καιροῦ πέρας	עַד מַעַד
11:36	ἕως ἃν συντελεσθῇ	μέχρις οὗ συντελεσθῇ	עַד כִּלּוֹ

The Hebrew construction *וַיָּבֹא* with a following participle is responsible for an unidiomatic literalism in the combination of a form of *εἶναι* in the third person singular with a participle usually arthrous as subject or as attributive to an unexpressed subject. Such occur in 8:4, 8, 27; 10:21; 11:16 and 45, all of them read by both Θ and the LXX. In the Hebrew 8:8 alone has the variant reading *הָיָה מְאֹד*. The construction is best described as well as understood by means of some actual examples.

	LXX	Θ	MT
8:4, 8	καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ῥυό- μενος	καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐξαιρού- μενος	וַיִּהְיֶה וַיִּסָּר
10:16	καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀνθεστηκώς	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἑστὼς	וַיִּהְיֶה וַיִּסָּר
10:21	καὶ οὐθεὶς ἦν ὁ βοηθῶν	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εἷς ἀντεχόμενος	וַיִּהְיֶה וַיִּסָּר

¹ 11:21; 8:10, 11, 13, 14; 9:27; 10:3; 11:35f.; 12:1, 4, 9.

² Θ so renders *לָמָּה* in 8:7.

An interesting literalism is to be found in the intransitive use of ποιεῖν for the Hebrew verb נָצַח, usually in conjunction with another verb as, for example, in 8:12, καὶ ἐποίησε καὶ εὐοδῶ-
θη.¹ Other instances are found in 8:4, 24; 11:3, 7, 30, 32, 36 and 39 in both translations. Again it is the frequency rather than the usage itself that is un-Greek.

A solecistic redundancy of expression occurs a few times in attempts to reproduce completely the subordinate clause which is introduced by ὅτι and uses other words to define its nature and relationship to the main clause. There are 4 of these in Θ, 2 in 1:4 and 1 each in 9:7 and 18, the last two also being read by the LXX. Those of 1:4 have been given on page 3 in illustration of LXX paraphrase. The other 2 are reproduced below.

	LXX	Θ	MT
9:7	εἰς ὅς διεσκόρπισας αὐτοῦς ἔκει	οὗ διέσπειρας αὐτοῦς ἔκει	עַשׂ עָתָה הָרַח אֶשׁ
9:18	ἐφ' ἧς ἐπεκλήθη τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπ' αὐτῆς	ἐφ' ἧς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπ' αὐτῆς	כִּשֶׁ נִקְרָא אֶשׁ זֶה

That the LXX should twice adopt these readings is not startling since, as we have seen, it often lapses into the most abject literalism.²

The physical expressions characteristically employed in Semitic languages to convey ideas are prominent in both of the translations. The LXX substitutes more idiomatic phraseology in only a few instances, e.g., in 1:8 and 8:3³ as already indicated on page 4. A few other outstanding occurrences are here added.⁴

	LXX	Θ	MT
1:4	εἶναι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ βασιλέως	ἑστάναι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ βασιλέως	לָעֵסֶד בְּהֵיכַל הַמֶּלֶךְ

¹Θ and the LXX for וְהַצְלִיחַ וְהַעֲזָרָה.

²The construction is not without Κοινή parallels. I noted a partial one in several U P Z documents, e.g. No. 8, ll. 9f., τὸ ... Ἀσταρτεῖον, ἐν ᾧ τυγχάνει ἐν τῇ κατοχῇ γεγονώς, κ.τ.λ.

³Cf. 10:5 where the LXX reads with Θ.

⁴See also 1:7; 8:5; 9:12, 18, 19; 10:3, 16, etc.

10:12	ἔδωκας τὸ πρόσωπόν σου διανοηθῆναι	ἔδωκας τὴν καρδίαν σου τοῦ συνεῖναι	נתת את לבך להבין
10:15	ἔδωκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν	Same	נתתי פני ארצה

A relative infrequency of compound verbs and adjectives and of adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees is also characteristic of the translations. The LXX, however, uses almost twice as many compound verbs as Θ. In chapter 1 it has a total of 23 as against 14 by Θ. It also has more adjectives than Θ, a total of 68 to 41 in the 2 chapters exclusive of substantive usages. But approximately 1/3 of these are numerals, and among them, also, the LXX has only 5 and Θ 3 compound forms, 2 of which in each are numerals. Among the remainder the LXX has 4 comparatives and Θ 2, 3 superlatives and Θ 1. All 4 of the latter are forms of *πρῶτος*. It is clear that Θ is satisfied with reproducing the adjectives of the Hebrew, whereas the LXX often introduces them in place of other constructions, particularly that of the attributive genitive. On the other hand there is an unmistakable tendency in both translations toward simple verbs and simple adjectives of positive degree.

The matter of word order in Daniel constitutes an outstanding and important literalism, especially in Θ. It is not treated here because a full presentation of it may be found in the study made by Professor Rife.¹ His findings indicate that translation Greek abandons the hypotactic and interpolative word order of natural Greek for the order of the Semitic original. This he has statistically stated for the relative order of subject, verb, and object as exhibited in the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek translations of Daniel compared with composition Greek of every variety from classical to modern.

¹Op. cit., chap. 4.

PART III

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES

Further marks of literal translation are revealed by a mere comparative survey of the differences between the two translations in their departures from the Hebrew. The divergences in the two sections under consideration, as they consist in omissions and additions and in alterations of nominal and verbal forms, are statistically summarized and discussed below. The tabulation of additions and omissions is exclusive of the article, preposition, and conjunction, which are treated separately.

Apart from these and from all omissions which are textual, i.e., either not in the translator's text or due to the vicissitudes of transmission, there are 28 words omitted entirely, 11 by Θ and 18 by the LXX. The relatively high number in Θ is due to the inexplicable omission of 8 words in 8:2, at least 2 of which, however, may be textual.¹ Otherwise these omissions are all attributable to free and idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew. A good number of them consist in no more than the omission of pronominal affixes. There were actually more omissions than these, especially in the LXX, where the Greek rendered the Hebrew meaning adequately in fewer words, but such were not included in the count. Yet it is here that the chief difference between Θ and the LXX lies. The former endeavors with few exceptions² faithfully to represent every word of his text in Greek; the latter is often content to render the meaning irrespective of the number of words or their exact correspondence to the original.

This difference between the two is even more pronounced

¹Added by V al²² Compl Ald Alex Chrys^{bis} Arab Slav^Ostrag (according to Holmes and Parsons) and marked as an addition on the other hand by the Syro-Hexaplaric and Chigi MSS.

²Especially prepositions.

in the matter of additions of words and phrases. In a total of 45¹ Θ has 13 and the LXX 42, 10 in chapter 8 coinciding. Theodotion's 3 independent additions (1:4,20; 8:21) and 2 shared by the LXX in 8:2 are merely forms of εἶναι implied in the Hebrew. Of the remaining 8, 3 others are also implied in the text (8:8 and 22 κέρματα; 8:14 ἡμέραι) and the other 5 are each additions of one word necessary to the Greek, all shared by the LXX.² In the LXX, in addition to the 5 noted as common to both translations, 3 others in 8:5,20, and 21 are forms of εἶναι implied in the original, 3 in 1:2,12, and 8:19 are perhaps textual, and 6 are apparently glosses.³ Τοῦτο in 8:17 is probably a rendering of the article of הַזֶּה with its original demonstrative force. At least 24 are due to free and paraphrastic translation.⁴ A translator like Θ, however, clearly refrains as much as possible from making additions that are not absolutely necessary.

The additions and omissions of the article would be about equal in number were it not for the special factor of the Hebrew definite construct forms which generally require its presence in the Greek. Of a total of 104 different additions,⁵ of which 74 coincide in the two translations, there are 73 due to constructs, 57 of them coinciding.⁶ Of the remaining 31 (Θ-23, LXX-25, coincide-17), 12 are added before proper names,⁷ 4, of which 3 coincide, make the noun definite in Greek,⁸ 6, of which 5 coincide, are due to feeling for Greek idiom or its demands,⁹ 4 have generic force,¹⁰ and 3 are for τ (Θ) and 2 for τ (both) before infinitives

¹Chap. 1-22 (Θ-2, LXX-20); chap. 8-23 (Θ-11, LXX-22).

²8:8 αὐτοῦ(1), 17 and 19 ἔτι, 19 ἡ ὁρασίς (LXX μενεῖ), 23 αὐτῶν.

³In 1:10,17 (bis),20 (bis); 8:16. The last 3 are so marked in the Syro-Hexaplar MS.

⁴E.g., in 1:3,5,12,13,15,17,18,21; 2:3; 8:2,3,4,5,26,27, etc.

⁵Not including those incidentally made within larger additions or glosses. The same applies to omissions. Inclusion of these would greatly increase the totals for the LXX.

⁶Chap. 1-45 (Θ-45, LXX-40, coincide-40); chap. 8-28 (Θ-23, LXX-22, coincide-17).

⁷Both in 1:7,9,10 and 8:21; Θ in 1:2; the LXX in 1:2,3,11, 19. The πρ in 1:2 and 9 is perhaps responsible for those of Θ.

⁸E.g., 1:15, "the ten days". In 8:7 εἰς is really definite.

⁹E.g., 2:1, τῷ δευτέρῳ.

¹⁰E.g., 8:4, τὰ θηρία (both).

in 2:2,3; 8:7,15, and 17. The high degree of coincidence which is exhibited by these additions suggests that most of them are due to the translator's sense of idiom.

Again the omissions are much fewer in number, especially in Θ . They total 7 in each chapter, of which Θ has 7 and the LXX 12, 5 coinciding. Two of these, in 8:2 and 5, together with 4 of the others,¹ were unnecessary to Greek idiom and usage. Four are due to the freedom of the LXX. Both translators transliterate the article of הסלצר in 1:11 and 16 as part of the noun. The LXX reads Κύριος for האלהים in 1:9, and its omission in 8:5 is probably a textual one.²

In the treatment of prepositions, however, omissions are of much the greater frequency. This is attributable especially to the constant Hebrew usage with nouns in expressing case relationships, a function often adequately discharged in the Greek by the case endings. In many instances the translators could have been more literal by adopting prepositional phrases,³ but more often, as in the expression of the indirect object, such procedure would have resulted in unidiomatic and even impossible Greek. This fact is attested by the high number of coincidences in the omissions, 49 in a total of 62. The total number for Θ is 54 and for the LXX 57.⁴ The preposition γ heads the list with 39 omissions. Among these, 18, of which 14 coincide, are rendered by the dative, in most cases of the indirect object. Eight in both Θ and the LXX are omitted from before infinitives. Of the remainder, 8 are rendered by the accusative of the direct object, 4 by a possessive genitive, and 1 by an adverbial accusative. There are 7 omissions of κ (dative - 3, genitive - 2, adverbial accusative - 1, paraphrase - 1), 7 of $\iota\kappa$ (genitive - 6, accusative - 1), 4 of $\gamma\alpha$ (all datives), and 1 each of $\epsilon\gamma$, $\alpha\alpha$, κ , $\gamma\epsilon$, and $\epsilon\gamma$. Of these last 5

¹ Θ in 1:17 and 8:3; the LXX in 8:9.

²Charles believes this the original reading.

³E.g., in 8:17 $\gamma\alpha$ is translated $\mu\alpha\iota$ by the LXX, but $\pi\rho\delta\epsilon$ $\mu\epsilon$ by Θ .

⁴Chap. 1-43 (Θ -38, LXX-40); chap. 8-19 (Θ -15, LXX-17). These are exclusive of a number within larger omissions, e.g., in 1:5; 8:1,8,24, etc.

the first 2 are translated by datives and the others occur within paraphrases. These statistics indicate that the translations are not far apart in their number and treatment of omissions, although there is a good deal of variety in the case translation of a given Hebrew prepositional phrase.¹ Where, also, the preposition itself is translated there are, notwithstanding a tendency towards representation, no less than 27 divergences between Θ and the LXX in these 2 chapters.

In spite of the profusion of prepositions in the Hebrew the translators have added others to the number of 18, 15 by the LXX and 8 by Θ .² All of those in chapter 8, however, are due to the He directive of the Hebrew³ and the remainder occur in free renderings by the LXX⁴ or in deference to Greek idiom.⁵ Three of the last are due to accusatives of the end of motion where the Hebrew may omit the preposition.

In the matter of conjunctions, that is to say καί, omissions also outnumber additions two to one. Here it is the ubiquity of the Hebrew ו that is responsible. Exclusive again of those occurring within more extensive ones, there are 10 additions⁶ and 20 omissions.⁷ Although the additions are about equal in number in Θ and the LXX, there is a wide difference in total omissions, Θ having only 5 and the LXX 17. Of the additions 6 are due to Greek idiom, 4 of them in a series of proper names, and the others are probably textual. Of the omissions 2 or 3 may be textual, 7 are due to altered constructions,⁸ and the remainder to Greek idiom or free renderings. There are at least 7 of the last variety, all of them in the LXX. Theodotion's variants, on the other hand, are almost all attributable to the demands of idiom.

The translators have both rendered the Hebrew nominal forms

¹See p. 19.

²Chap. 1-11 (Θ -4, LXX-10); chap. 8-7 (Θ -4, LXX-5). These are exclusive of a half-dozen more within extensive additions.

³E.g., in 8:4, 7, and 10.

⁴Seven in 1:12, 13, 16, 18, and 2:1.

⁵Four in 1:1, 2, and 20.

⁶Chap. 1-8 (Θ -6, LXX-6); chap. 8-2 (Θ -1, LXX-2).

⁷Chap. 1-8 (Θ -3, LXX-7); chap. 8-12 (Θ -2, LXX-10).

⁸Five are substitutions of participial for finite verbal forms.

with a fairly high degree of accuracy. Yet they have altered the number of at least 15 nouns, 12 of them from singular to plural. The LXX has 9 and 6 7 of these divergences, most of them due to free or idiomatic translation.¹ Another item of interest is the fact that the translators differ at least 28 times in their case translation of the same nouns. Less than 1/4 of these are attributable to the use of different prepositions with the nouns. In most of the others the LXX has adopted paraphrastic readings, and in general its renderings are more idiomatic and less literal than those of 6.²

Verbal forms have been treated with less pious regard. A total of 43 different deviations from the Hebrew were detected, 20 in mood,³ 4 in tense, 10 in voice, 7 in number, and 2 in person. There are 10 substitutions of participial for finite forms, 8 by the LXX⁴ and 3 by 6,⁵ 1 in 1:10 coinciding. Since those of 1:11 and 8:26, however, are probably merely due to different pointings of the Hebrew text, this alteration is practically confined to the LXX. Infinitives are read for finite forms 4 times in the LXX, 1 being shared with 6 in 1:5. In 1:12 the LXX renders the Hebrew *waw* conjunctive of the imperfect after an imperative to express purpose by the infinitive with ὥστε where 6 mistranslates. The other 2 occur in paraphrases in 1:5 (διδόσθαι) and 2:1 (παράθεσαι). Finite forms occur for the same participles in both translations at 1:10, 16 and 8:19.⁶ The LXX has another in 8:8 for *wayy*. Both in 8:23 read participles in a genitive absolute for *wa* with the infinitive. In 1:15 the LXX reads a subjunctive (φανῆ) for an imperative.

Theodotion is chiefly responsible for the departures in tense, only 1 of the 4 being shared by the LXX. This is as it

¹Αὐτῶν (1:22) and ἐσχάτων (1:23) may be textual.

²E.g., in 8:22, κατὰ τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν for ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτῶν (6 for כִּכְחוֹ). But cf. 2:4, πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα for τῷ βασιλεῖ (יְהוֹזָבָב).

³Including for convenience the infinitive and participle.

⁴In 1:1, 10, 11; 2:2; 8:18, 22, 27 (bis).

⁵In 1:10; 8:19, 26.

⁶For יָרָא, נָחַן, and מוֹדִיעַן.

should be, for as far as the Hebrew is concerned the variants are all really mistranslations. In 8:4 Θ has an aorist (ἐποίησεν) for a waw conversive of the perfect.¹ In 8:17 he reads a present (πίπτω) for a waw conversive of the imperfect and in the following verse the same for a nifal perfect.² In 8:4 Θ reads a future (στήσονται) and the LXX a simple aorist (ἔστησαν) for a potential imperfect. There are also a few other differences between Θ and the LXX which involve no recognizable departures from the Hebrew. A kal infinitive in 8:7, e.g., is translated by a present (ἐρχεσθαι) in the LXX and by an aorist (ἐλθεῖν) in Θ. In 8:13 the LXX reads an imperfect (ἤκουον) and Θ an aorist (ἤκουσα) for a waw conversive of the imperfect. The rendering of the LXX here, in view of the following piel participle, is perhaps the better.

All of the 10 actual variants in voice³ are by the LXX, only 1 in 8:12 being shared by Θ. Actives for passives occur in 8:1 (εἶδον and ἰδεῖν), and passives for actives in 1:18 (εἰσῆχθησαν), 2:2 (εἰσενεχθῆναι), 8:10 (ἐρράχθη and κατεπατήθη), 8:12 (ἐρρίφη, Θ-ἐρίφη), and 8:25 (ὕψωθήσεται). In 8:15 the LXX reads an intransitive θεωρεῖν where the Hebrew followed by Θ has an active infinitive with a direct object. The LXX has also altered the text in 1:13 by reading an active imperative (χρῆσαι) with an object (τοῖς παισὶ σου) where the Hebrew verb is intransitive and followed by a prepositional phrase.⁴ The variant in 8:12, however, is probably due merely to a different pointing of the Hebrew.

The variants in number are almost equally divided, the LXX having 1 more than Θ. The LXX reads plurals for singulars in 1:6 (ῆσαν) and 18 (εἰσῆχθησαν) and Θ in 1:10* (συνεπάτησαν),⁵ 1:15 (ὠράθησαν), and 1:19 (εὐρέθησαν). The LXX has singulars for plurals in 1:12 (δοθήτω) and 13 (φανῇ). It also has both of the variants in person, reading a first for second in 1:10 (κινδυνεύσω) and a first for third in 8:1 (τὸ ἰδεῖν με).⁶

¹The LXX reads ἐποίησεν.

²The LXX reads ἔπεσαν and ἐκαταμήτην respectively.

³I.e., exclusive of mere forms.

⁴Θ reads literally ποιήσον μετὰ τῶν παιδων σου.

⁵Probably textual.

⁶Θ translates τὴν ὁφειδῶν μοι.

Among these verbal variants there were only 8 shared by 6 and the LXX. Almost all of the 38 by the latter occurred in free or idiomatic translation, whereas at least 5 of the 13 by 6 were due to misinterpretation of the Hebrew. There is no consistent practice of alteration discernible in either, the only variant of any frequency being the substitution of participles for finite verbal forms by the LXX. The aorist and future for the Hebrew perfect and imperfect respectively are the favorite tenses of the translators. There are a few imperfects and presents, the latter mostly participles. Perfects are rare, the LXX having 3 and 6 only 1, all of them participles. This diminished usage is another feature of the *Koivḥ*, and yet Susanna, which is about equal in extent to the 2 Hebrew chapters, uses perfects 11 times. Subjunctives are also infrequent, the LXX having 3 and 6 4 in chapter 1, 3 of them coinciding. There are none in chapter 8.

Finally, there is a group of divergences in which Hebrew words have been rendered by entirely different parts of speech. There were some 31 instances of this, 24 by the LXX and 9 by 6. The only ones worth mentioning as recurrent are the substitution of adjectives for attributive genitives of the noun, 8 times in the LXX,¹ and the use of the article to translate the relative *אשר*, 4 times in each.² The slightly extended use of adjectives in the LXX reveals, as we noted, another endeavor to escape from literalism.

¹In 1:3,4,5,10,13,15; 8:2,27.

²In 1:11 and 8:21 (LXX); 8:19 and 26 (6); 1:10 bis (both).

CONCLUSIONS

As revealed by this study, then, the literalisms and the translation characteristics of Daniel may be allocated to the following categories:

1. Reproduction of original word order.
2. Representation of each word.
3. Parataxis.
4. Systematic representation
5. Overuse of certain good, or possible but uncommon Greek locutions.
6. Infrequency or absence of certain common Greek usages.
7. Transliteration.

The order of these phenomena might be taken to represent roughly their relative importance if for the LXX number 4 be placed after 6 and the positions of 2 and 3 reversed. The LXX departures from the Hebrew, as we have seen, are generally more significant and extensive as well as more numerous than those of Θ . Yet it also lapses into literalism continually, while Θ is inexplicably free in places. The variants of the latter, however, are mostly due to feeling for Greek idiom rather than to free translation.

Characteristic overusages noted were those of $\kappa\alpha\iota$, personal pronouns, ἰδοὺ , ἐν τῷ with the infinitive, literal rendering of physical expressions idiomatic to Hebrew, expressions of comparison by a prepositional phrase, ἐνώπιον , ἕως , intransitive πορεύειν , unidiomatic representation of וְאִי with a participle, and a redundant translation in אֲשֶׁר clauses. Infrequent or absent were subordinating idioms and conjunctions, particles, subjunctives, perfects and imperfects, compound verbs and adjectives, and adjectives of comparative or superlative degree.¹

¹Compound nouns were also infrequent.

In connection with the probable validity of conjectural emendation of a Greek text on the basis of a hypothetical Semitic original the departures from the Hebrew are significant. Exclusive of those occurring within large additions or omissions and of errors and transliterations there are at least 307 differences in the LXX and 242 in Θ in the two chapters. The fact that 167 of these coincide would seem at first to indicate that in Θ at least deviations are extensively of a nature which might be predicated from the Hebrew. But this can only be affirmed of the addition of articles for Hebrew constructs and the omission of certain prepositions as already indicated. These two account for 57 and 49 of the coincidences respectively. Yet there are 16 differences in the treatment of constructs and 13 in that of these particular prepositions. In relatively few, also, of the remaining coincidences does the departure from the Hebrew extend to translation by Greek that is identical in vocabulary or construction. We have seen that the translations differ 28 times in their case usage of nouns and 27 in their choice of a preposition when they are rendering the same Hebrew. From the figures given above their total minimum number of differences would amount to 382, but in reality they are even more extensive. Except, also, for a few inevitable commonplaces, neither of them exhibit any invariable or wholly consistent lexical representation.

APPENDIX

THE SEPTUAGINT AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

Professor Swete in his introductory volume to The Old Testament in Greek makes the following noteworthy statement:

The Septuagint is not less indispensable to the study of the New Testament than to the Old. But its importance in the former field is more often overlooked, since its connection with the New Testament is less direct and obvious, except in the case of express quotations from the Alexandrian version. These, as we have seen, are so numerous that in the Synoptic Gospels and in some of the Pauline Epistles they form a considerable part of the text. But the New Testament has been yet more widely and more deeply influenced by the version through the subtler forces which shew themselves in countless allusions, lying oftentimes below the surface of the words, and in the use of a vocabulary derived from it, and in many cases prepared by it for the higher service of the Gospel.¹

In view of this kinship in thought and diction the translation characteristics of the LXX should be admirable criteria for use in evaluating the Greek of New Testament documents alleged to be translations from the Semitic. The extant non-literary Κοινή has been interrogated for New Testament usages alleged to be Semitisms.² The New Testaments documents should be examined for phenomena that have been established as translation characteristics from a study of actual translations. The fact that the proponents of the translation hypothesis have employed neither of these criteria is an indictment of both their methods and results.³

¹p. 450.

²Recently, e.g., the case for an Aramaic original of the Fourth Gospel based upon lists of alleged Aramaisms has been demolished by Professor E. C. Colwell in The Greek of the Fourth Gospel (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1931) through a study primarily of Epictetus and the papyri.

³For a comparative statement on methodology see Professor D. W. Riddle, "The Logic of Translation Greek", The Journal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932), 13-30.

The examination of the Gospels with respect to a few of the translation characteristics of Daniel which were Semitic in nature proved to be an experiment interestingly productive in result and highly suggestive of the applicability and effectiveness of the method. The findings can be briefly summarized. Parataxis is not nearly so pronounced as even in the LXX of Daniel.¹ Subordinate clauses and genitive absolutes are much more in evidence. Γάρ and ἀλλὰ, almost non-extant in Daniel, are very frequent. The μέν - δέ construction occurs 20 times in Matthew, 6 in Mark, and 8 in John. Δέ itself, which is found only 7 times in the entire book of Daniel, occurs 9 times in the first 2 chapters of Mark and is 2 or 3 times as frequent in Matthew. Adjectives and compound verbs and nouns are more numerous. Comparatives and superlatives are more frequently used, and when the former occurs it is almost always followed by the genitive of comparison. There are, e.g., 5 comparatives and 3 superlatives in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, 4 of the former followed by the genitive. In the Fourth Gospel there are 13 occurrences of μείζων alone, 12 of them with the genitive.

On the other hand a number of literalisms are absent or rare. The use of a prepositional phrase to express comparison is found in the entire New Testament only in Luke (4 times) and Hebrews (8 times).² Similarly ἐνώπιον occurs nowhere in Matthew and Mark and only once in John (20:33), but in Luke it is found no less than 23 times and in Revelation 34 times. The statistics for ἰδοὺ reveal a somewhat different situation. Matthew uses it 62 times, Mark 6, Luke 56, and John 4. Other usages which are really only Hebraisms and occur, as is well known, frequently in Luke but rarely in the other Gospels, cannot legitimately be used as criteria for judgment here.

The examples given suffice, however, for illustration. They confirm the impression that Luke is consciously imitating the style and vocabulary of the LXX. This would be natural for a

¹See E. C. Colwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 10ff., for statistics on syndeton and parataxis in the Fourth Gospel.

²All with κατὰ.

Gentile and a Greek, but conscious or unconscious imitation of his native speech idiom would be more natural for a Jew. Is this not what we find, for example, in Matthew's ἰδοὺ and τότε and other such overusages of expressions corresponding to Semitic idioms? The presence of many Greek usages rarely found in translation Greek would indicate that the Gospels as translations must be extraordinarily free and paraphrastic, much more so than the LXX version of Daniel. If this be so it would be a somewhat precarious procedure to reconstruct hypothetical Semitic originals on the basis of the Greek text. More significance should be attached to the absence in the Gospels of usages which can be established as translation characteristics than to a capricious overusage of certain "literalisms" that are good Greek and can be easily explained as due to the author's native idiom.

